

AAU/ARL Global Resources Program
Conference Summary
The AAU/ARL Global Resources Program: Catalyst for Cooperation
A Conference Sponsored by the Association of Research
Libraries and The Library of Congress
The James Madison Memorial Building
Library of Congress
Washington, DC
June 24, 1998

1. **Welcome (Expectations for the Conference)**

A. Winston Tabb, Associate Librarian of Congress, welcomed the 56 Conference participants and gave a very brief overview of the Library of Congress (LC) overseas acquisitions operations and the role of LC's six field offices. He noted that more than one-half of the printed materials added to LC's collections are in languages other than English. Three events provide the backdrop for today's Conference: (1) As a result of a General Accounting Office question concerning the legitimacy of LC's overseas operations, which have been in existence since the early 1960's, the Congress passed unambiguous legislation authorizing LC's overseas program; (2) ALA President Barbara Ford's choice of the 1998 ALA Annual Conference theme-- Global Reach; Local Touch; and (3) The AAU/ARL Global Resources Program provides the impetus for increased cooperation between LC and the research and library communities. Mr. Tabb stated that the objectives of this Conference are to generate projects and ideas for strengthening the partnership between LC and its constituents who have a stake in acquiring and accessing world research resources and to develop a concrete action plan for assessing and implementing a number of the projects and ideas.

B. Duane E. Webster, Executive Director of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), outlined ARL's long-standing concern about declining resources, particularly in the area of non-U.S. research resources. He emphasized the need for a fresh, different approach to cooperation. The Farmington Plan fulfilled a need during its day and ceased operations because of changing times and situations. The North American research community needs a new cooperative scheme. The AAU/ARL Global Resources Program is a promising approach to meet current needs. Mr. Webster acknowledged the support of Betty G. Bengtson, Director of University Libraries, University of Washington, Chair of the AAU/ARL Global Resources Program Advisory Board, and incoming ARL President. He also acknowledged the generous support of The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and its role in furthering the goals of the AAU/ARL Global Resources Program.

2. **Conference Context/Background**

In providing the context and background for the Conference, Richard Ekman, Secretary of The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, noted that scholarship within the U.S. is becoming more international. Studies have determined that scholars cannot rely exclusively on North American publications for research. Mellon has been concerned for some time about the changes in scholarly activity and declining library acquisitions in the worsening budgetary climate. The Foundation is interested in developing strategies that will provide more resources for travel by scholars, use of interlibrary loan (ILL), cataloging and organizing collections, cooperative acquisitions, and microfilming and digitizing research materials. Mr. Ekman mentioned, as examples, the technical based consortia Mellon has encouraged in Eastern Europe and South Africa, its interests in direct grants to Latin American libraries to modernize cataloging systems and to seek agreements with North American libraries, and Mellon support for the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) foreign newspaper projects. He also mentioned the refugee affairs collection at Oxford University that is being digitized. He stated that the AAU/ARL Global Resources Program is an overarching project. Through this Program, cost containment, increased cooperative acquisitions, and a distributed approach to collection building and access by electronic means are worthy goals. He acknowledged that LC has been a major resource in research activities. Today's agenda is a very welcome means to advance the needs

within the scholarly community. Libraries cannot collect as comprehensively as they have in the past. Who will pay for these cooperative approaches? Mr. Ekman stated that Mellon can contribute a little, and other foundations can contribute a little. The real answer, however, is that universities and research libraries must reallocate their budgets to meet research needs.

3. AAU/ARL Global Resources Program Progress Report

Deborah Jakubs, Director of the AAU/ARL Global Resources Program, provided an overview of the Program, reminding the participants that the initial Conference information packet includes a progress report. She acknowledged the role and support of The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The Program began with three projects: (1) The Latin Americanist Research Resources Project (40 participants); (2) The Japanese Journal Access Project (29 participants); and (3) The German Resources Project (27 participants). Two new projects, the Digital South Asia Library and the Cooperative African Newspapers Project, are also underway. Finally, there are two additional projects under development, one for Southeast Asia and one for the Middle East. As stated, expanded access and cost containment are among the Program's goals.

There are varying numbers of participants for each project; however, as important as the numbers are, the benefits to libraries and researchers must be kept in mind. Participating libraries contribute labor and time, but all libraries benefit from these efforts. The challenges to the Program include carving out various roles for libraries that may have different interests and developing partnerships, especially partnerships outside of North America. Additional activities include the need to educate and engage faculty and develop allies among the research community and to identify and define the role of lead institutions.

Dr. Jakubs cited the need to change the behavior of librarians as one of the on-going challenges. As an example of positive behavioral change, the Latin Americanist Research Resources Project made a major commitment for participants to reallocate 7% or \$3,000 or more of their Latin America book budgets to deepen the collections in areas of their individual, established strengths. Through this cooperative approach, everyone benefits. There is the acknowledged difficulty, however, of changing institutional and individual behavior patterns. She also mentioned that ILL is critical to the successful functioning of the Program. Researchers depend on access to remote materials.

The participants contributed a number of comments to this portion of the agenda. One participant noted that the AAU/ARL Global Resources Program provides a potential model for fields other than area studies and collection development. Responding to a comment on the role of the Association of American Universities (AAU), Dr. Jakubs outlined AAU's involvement in early studies, its early commitments to the Program, its membership on the Global Resources Program Advisory Board, its endorsement of Program activities, and the possibility that the Program may be on AAU's agenda at its upcoming September meeting. Another participant commented that focusing on the role of lead institutions is a way to institutionalize the projects. Responding to other questions/comments, Dr. Jakubs noted that there may be no single model for success; many models may work with careful attention to best practices. One participant encouraged the use of economic analyses for the models; there is a need to understand the costs and benefits of the various projects and to look at them from the user's point of view. Dr. Jakubs mentioned the survey of the Latin Americanist Research Resources Project includes collecting data on internal costs. Another participant asked about plans for future projects in other areas of the world. Dr. Jakubs responded by emphasizing that the Program relies on area librarians and their professional associations to develop models for specific areas.

The presentation concluded with stressing the common Program themes, distributed collections and access to research materials through various means, including electronic access. There are no complete answers, but there are a number of models that may serve as possible responses to the various questions on Program direction.

4. Description of Library of Congress Area Studies and Library of Congress Field Office Activities

A. Carolyn Brown, Assistant Librarian for Library Services and Acting Director for Area Studies Collections at LC, noted that with the recent reorganization of LC's acquisitions operations, the Acquisitions Directorate's new responsibilities for acquiring materials along geographic/regional lines now dove-tail

with the area studies organizational structure. This makes it much easier for the various staff to coordinate activities and work together. She also mentioned that LC area studies is using a different approach. Rather than talk about "foreign languages" and "foreign collections," LC actually provides resources for understanding international information.

Dr. Brown noted that the Congress increased LC's acquisitions budget for this fiscal year, after three years of flat acquisitions budgets, and that the Congress has supported non-English acquisitions in the past. Another approach used by LC is the inclusion of the Internet as a resource. She referred the participants to a June 18, 1998 New York Times article on the subject. The Internet is becoming more multi-lingual; the largest growth on the Internet is in non-English resources, particularly in India and China. For example, there is interest in LC about Chinese scientific and technical information, which is available over the Internet. The Internet is becoming a major, emerging factor in global resources.

There is also interest in the future of area studies librarianship. It is closely linked to resources and collections. There have been two conferences on the subject at Indiana University, and there have been other meetings as well. There is a need for developing "new area studies librarians." During recent, informal discussions between LC and the Ford Foundation, the topic of area studies librarianship emerged. These discussions included the problem of small applicant pools for hiring the next generation of area studies librarians. Dr. Brown mentioned that one idea for building the applicant pool and making the field more attractive is the possible use of internships or consultations at LC and/or in its overseas field offices. When PL 480 funds were available, it was possible to bring in expertise to build collections or have scholars and bibliographers develop bibliographies. Some of these projects could be to strengthen collections. As the discussion at today's Conference progresses, this approach could be kept in mind. Dr. Brown distributed copies of a draft paper on Area Studies Librarianship that was shared with the Ford Foundation and others. The concept of internships/consultations is included along with other projects. She emphasized that the discussions with the Ford Foundation are still quite informal.

B. Judy C. McDermott, Chief of the African/Asian acquisitions and Overseas Operations Division at LC, noted that she and the LC field directors are wrapping up a two week meeting planned to take place prior to and during this Conference. She introduced the six field directors and the assistant field director in India and the three section heads from her division. Carolyn Brown also introduced the area studies division chiefs. Ms. McDermott stated that she and the field office managers and others had a stimulating meeting preparing for this conference and discussing/brainstorming about the future and the possible future partnerships and projects. She distributed several pages of ideas that the field office managers and area studies chiefs had identified as potential projects **[these potential projects are included in the latter part of this Conference summary]**. They are based on thoughts about improving field office services to LC, to cooperative acquisitions program participants, and to other institutions which also have international interests. She noted that she is also looking for partnerships that will assist the overseas operations program. The list, Ms. McDermott emphasized, is not to stifle additional thoughts and ideas. It is far from complete and all inclusive.

The participants had a few comments/suggestions regarding this portion of the agenda. Winston Tabb emphasized one important point. LC is interested in exploring distributed collections, particularly digital, if there can be certainty that the collections will be accessible in perpetuity. People should not worry about where the resources are physically located but where they are available or accessible. He wants LC to move in that direction, but as the nation's last-resort research library, and library for Congress, LC has some unique obligations that must inform its decisions about any experiments in distributed collection-building. Another participant suggested that priority be given to access to databases in other countries. Working directly with publishers for digitized content is an example of this approach. One participant suggested that increases in funding and initial funding should ensure that the funding extends beyond the initial start-up. A participant noted that one of the problems with the Japanese Journal Access Project is the intersection of area studies and the subject disciplines. There should be discipline-based approaches to accessing Web sites. LC could be a piece of that. One participant noted the lack of standardization in foreign languages, particularly in the automated approach.

The above discussions provided the background and impetus for the most important part of the Conference-- brainstorming projects and ideas. Kathryn J. Deiss, ARL/OLMS Senior Program Officer for Training and Leadership, facilitated the discussion, and Mary E. Jackson, Access and Delivery Services Consultant at ARL, captured the essence of the recorded suggestions and discussions. Ms. Deiss reminded the participants that the ideas generated by LC's field office managers and area studies chiefs will be part of the record and that new suggestions and proposals are welcomed and needed. The list generated by LC was not meant to be all inclusive. Ms. Deiss organized and facilitated the session as follows:

Cooperation/Collaboration Between LC Field Offices and Area Studies and the Academic Community

Obstacles

1. Bureaucracy, including in-country, institutional, and academic.
2. Conceptualization of problem; the national need not a single problem. Conceptualization of world need.
3. Trying to deal with the "multiple voice."
4. Documentation of problem. Case studies and understanding when we are successful (performance measures).
5. Access not as quick as owning.
6. Competing needs. Investing dollars within.
7. Framework for investment.
8. High cost of technical infrastructure.
9. How are field offices viewed by scholars?
10. Don't have field office staff communicating like scholars; future of electronic communication.
11. Lack of objective analysis for resource allocation and collecting.
12. Duplicative organizations with competing purposes.
13. Scholars competing with same base of resources.
14. The problem of logistical infrastructure in country (e.g., electricity, phone service, etc.).
15. Worry from book dealers about "one copy" and field offices.
16. Western bias when talking about Web.
17. Competition between LC and research university for the "one copy."
18. Lack of communication between area studies organizations to share accomplishments.
19. Create "replacements" for national libraries not collaborating.
20. Think about going back to "golden age."
21. Culture of area studies librarians not inclined to be collaborative.
22. Mandates administrators put on bibliographers.
23. Added responsibilities put on bibliographers to cover new areas.
24. Paranoia and defensiveness.
25. Why persist with traditional ILL model? (Create new structures.)
26. Put technology issues off to side.
27. "We have lots of money."
28. Copyright legislation.
29. Not yet in electronic environment; still publishing in hard copy.
30. Physical delivery.
31. Tyranny of the numbers - collection size.

Incentives To LC/Academic Library Cooperation

1. Access to more of world's information at less expense to the individual institution.
2. Access to same information for **same** amount.
3. Technology transfer to academic institution.
4. Improved network of scholars.
5. New career paths for everyone!
6. National need - information as increasing proportion of GNP.
7. Broader audience/greater effect for scholars.
8. Increased funding - using funds more wisely.

9. Easier to get funds for collaborative projects.
10. Overt expression of value of collaboration.
11. Publications with different perspectives.
12. Closer engagement with faculty.
13. Energized bibliographers to do special projects.
14. Genuine mutuality of benefit.
15. Question funding prospects by Congress.
16. Need to define performance measures - beyond volume count.
17. Rewards for collaborating.
18. Broadening field office mission to include interaction with scholars.
19. How programs can send product to "isolated/distributed" scholars.
20. Focus on collaborating of Title VI collections and LC.
21. Successful models - Japanese history.

Concrete Projects/Ideas

1. Task Force to meet to collect information and develop drafts.
2. Description of activities of LC to area specialists/faculty.
3. LC take initiative - contact associations for input.
4. Replicating Cornell/LC film.
5. Move quickly on bi-lateral project.
6. Article level indexing of journals (Brazil?).
7. Criteria to choose the region - area of large U.S. scholarship and work underway.
8. Commercializing the indexes?
9. More immediate access to GLIN (Global Legal Information Network); expansion of GLIN - Gazettes.
10. Newsletter online.
11. English language indexing.
12. Indexing in non-Roman languages.
13. Table of contents/direct ordering for materials in developing countries - doing Latin America model in big way.
14. Long-term commitment to cataloging and making available.
15. List of filming activities - in-process and completed (put on Web).
16. Make easier to buy film **direct** from field office - distributed distribution.
17. NRMM (records now in OCLC and RLIN).
18. Make existing tools more useful.
19. Make easier to buy from LC.
20. Work with libraries and booksellers to make services more accessible - MARC format and workshops.
21. Records in MARC format - booksellers.
22. Local vendors to train librarians abroad.
23. Create knowledgeable book industry.
24. Locus for facilitating collaboration.
25. Make annual reports more widely available - publicize.
26. Preservation of newspapers (filming).
27. Joint university projects (U.S. university and university in other geographic area).
28. Official gazettes - CRL- film - digitize (LC get behind this project).
29. ICON - International Coalition on Newspapers.
30. Better understanding of world publishing output.
31. Use newspapers as new model - digital content-make accessible.
32. Creation of regional union catalogs.
33. "More studies."
34. Scenarios of information needs - National need.
35. 4-7 case studies in country. Scholars, librarians, etc. To set new priorities. Bid from National Opinion Research Center.

36. Go to areas where high interest in digital technology and build on.
37. Involve libraries in enriching indexes.
38. Sister institutions - Training, travel grants to U.S., matching grants to encourage faculty collaboration in sister institution.
39. Make resources available nationally, not just major research institutions.
40. Macro level of delivery of information among ARL institutions. User-initiated - circulation model.
41. Web-only documents - archiving - how to identify.
42. Leadership on copyright issues reference preservation.
43. Get participant programs started in existing field offices.
44. Encourage competition among vendors/dealers.
45. Regional conferences and groups of scholarly associations meet in international venue.
46. Challenge area studies associations to invite librarians to meetings.
47. Exchange field office staff with bibliographers/librarians (Mellon may fund such an endeavor).

Where Should the Library of Congress Be in Five Years?

Results of a June 23, 1998 Brainstorming Session

Just prior to this Conference, the LC area studies divisions and LC's acquisitions and overseas operations organizational units collaborated in a brainstorming session. Taking advantage of the presence of LC's field directors, the purpose of the session was to suggest projects/ideas that could be considered in the context of the AAU/ARL Global Resources Program/Library of Congress Conference. The projects/ideas listed below are not mutually exclusive of the projects/ideas discussed during the Conference brainstorming session.

Take on a larger preservation role in the offices.

1. Explore the potential for scanning in the overseas environment.
2. Establish microform operations in all six offices.
3. Institute "on-demand" microformatting service to outside libraries.
4. Expand MIPP to cover Pakistan.
5. Take on Ford Foundation project of microfilming manuscripts in Southeast Asia.

Create and provide new products.

1. Revive Archive of World Literature on Tape.
2. Create indexes of journal articles modeled on current Nairobi publication; include vernacular, English, and other Western European languages.
3. Create bibliographies of government publications.
4. Create directories of exchange sources.
5. Create book review guides.
6. Create index of Ph.D. dissertations.
7. Participate in LC efforts to provide lists of important but less well-known publications.

Improve services to CAP (Cooperative Acquisitions Program) participants and to LC.

1. Offer reference services to participants.
2. Expand/improve/initiate on-demand document delivery services, e.g., journal articles, theses, ephemera, gray literature.
3. Develop Web-based selection procedures.
4. Package and offer ephemera/gray literature on current events/hot topics (BPG).
5. Expand services and products on the Web.
6. Provide faster service.
7. Sell microformat products directly to participants from the field offices.
8. Seek partnerships with scholars and other institutions in crafting grant and fund-raising proposals for projects of mutual benefit.

Improve access to serials, including newspapers.

1. Systematically fill gaps in retrospective holdings.
2. Systematically claim and report on missing issues.
3. Create indexes of journal articles, modeled on current Nairobi publication; include vernacular, English and other Western languages.
4. Identify, acquire, and preserve retrospective serials from the area.
5. Identify, acquire, and preserve short-lived serials, as well as long runs.

Evaluate acquisitions coverage, identify strengths and weaknesses, and act to build on strengths, correct weaknesses.

1. Improve coverage of West Africa.
2. Improve coverage of Central Asia.
3. Consider Chinese Documentation Center, like Japan Documentation Center (JDC).
4. Reinstate collection of subnational publications at LC.
5. Collect publications from Papua, New Guinea and related islands.
6. Improve acquisition of area studies materials published outside the area.
7. Expand and improve acquisitions of electronic media.
8. Respond more quickly to document current events.
9. Use offices to acquire materials from additional countries.
10. Improve coverage of publications from regional IO's and NGO's.
11. Improve collection of "contract" studies.
12. Improve coverage of business and sci-tech materials.
13. Identify retrospective collections for purchase by LC or other institutions.
14. Collect and organize/package ephemera/gray literature on BPG model.
15. Seek partnerships overseas for providing cooperative digitized access to complementary collections.

Expand the Cooperative Acquisitions Program (CAP) customer base.

1. Include profiles attractive to public libraries, e.g., popular reading materials.
2. Seek ways to provide services to national libraries.
3. Develop customized "boutique" profiles, e.g., narrow subjects such as women's issues, new markets such as special subject libraries.
4. Advertise to new markets on listserves.
5. Advertise LC's services at area studies meetings.

Establish/maintain/strengthen ties with overseas scholarship via the offices.

1. Play active role in alerting overseas scholars about LC and national U.S. programs; encourage use of LC and other U.S. research collections.
2. Get feedback from scholarly users concerning LC and other collections.
3. Establish foreign scholar-in-residence program at LC.
4. Take advantage of field director presence to increase involvement in overseas Fulbright committees.
5. Use visiting scholars to assess LC collections.
6. Identify foreign materials for inclusion in review publications, e.g., Choice, Library Journal, World Literature.

Improve LC cataloging.

1. Expand cataloging in vernacular scripts.
2. Expand/initiate subject cataloging in offices.
3. Catalog retrospective microform collections.
4. Initiate LC cataloging of newspapers.

Act as agents for other LC services/programs.

1. Cataloging in Publication.

2. Preassigned card number program.
3. U.S. Copyright applications.
4. Promote international "Centers for the Book."
5. Advertise GLIN (Global Legal Information Network).
6. Provide ways to purchase Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) products with local currencies.
7. Assist in providing/packaging/marketing Photoduplication Service products.
8. Take lead in LC outreach in foreign regional library communities.

Desired infrastructure improvements.

1. Seek clarified role/partnership for overseas offices in LC's overall preservation/microformatting program.
2. Establish an intern program in the overseas offices, as one means to focus on and implement new programs, as well as provide training in area studies librarianship.

Main Themes From Concrete Projects/Ideas

1. Indexing.
2. Training/professional development.
3. Microfilming availability.
4. Case studies/national need.
5. New models for collaboration (e.g., ILL).
6. International collaborations.
7. Communications.
8. Digital information.

Winston Tabb said he originally envisioned two possible wrap-up scenarios. One would deal with clear ideas that could be implemented fairly easily, and that would then be implemented. The other scenario would be to step back, distribute the list of projects/ideas, solicit further input, and then follow-up. On the whole, he believes the second scenario is the more appropriate path.

He sees where LC can take immediate steps, such as improving communications (e.g., making annual reports readily available and publicizing their Web sites). Working with participants, LC can follow-up on indexing programs. Finally, he can follow-up on the questions raised about availability of microform materials from LC's Photoduplication Service. The other items belong to broader user groups and require additional review, input and work.

Deborah Jakubs stated there is plenty of work to go around. There is great interest in possible collaborations with LC. She emphasized that ARL's role is to coordinate a variety of activities within the AAU/ARL Global Resources Program and to engage partners in these activities to make them successful. She mentioned that Martha Brogan, Director of Collection Development and University Bibliographer at Indiana University, offered to set up and coordinate an AAU/ARL Global Resources Program Electronic Newsletter (including all participants at this conference). She may establish an AAU/ARL Global Resources Program Listserv as an initial project. This would be a very useful step in furthering the work that will result from the conference. Dr. Jakubs noted that today's conference was a catalyst for the next steps of the Program. ARL and LC will work together in sorting things out and will get back to the participants for further input, utilizing the new Electronic Newsletter or Listserv as a communications vehicle.

John Vaughn, Executive Vice President of the Association of American Universities, took the opportunity to inform the participants about AAU support. Since its inception, the Program has been of major importance to AAU. He sees it not only as an important Program for obtaining library materials and making them available through various means, but also as a potential model to broaden collaborative work in other academic areas. He noted that some communities are more organized to compete through cooperation. Mutual self-interest is a key point in the AAU/USAID relationship. Mr. Vaughn mentioned that he had met with an official from USAID the previous day. The two discussed the previous troubled relationship between universities and USAID. Those relationships were

improved by putting into place organizational structures that permitted them to move from suspicion to receptivity. The AAU/ARL Global Resources Program serves as a potential model to follow. He said that AAU is encouraged by this Conference and thanked the attendees for their participation.
